

## REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 9, 10, 16, 25, 26 and 27. The remaining claims 1-8, 11-15, 17-24 and 28-32 stand rejected. Claim 11 has been amended. Claim 16 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested in view of the following.

Claims 1-8, 11-15, 17, 18, 20-24, 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,414,400 to Scott (the “Scott reference”). The Applicants respectfully traverse. As an initial matter, it is noted that the Scott reference is of the type that can be overcome under 37 CFR § 1.131 and the Applicant’s reserve the right to do so. Even assuming arguendo that the Scott reference is properly applied, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable as explained in the following comments.

In order to anticipate, each and every element and limitation of the subject claim must be disclosed in a single reference. In rejecting independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that the Scott reference discloses “one or more combustion chambers and a source of gaseous fuel mixing gaseous fuel and air upstream of the one or more combustion chambers to provide a mixture of air and fuel to the engine for combustion,” on column 3, line 64. After a careful review of the Scott reference, it is respectfully submitted that it fails to disclose, among other things, “gaseous fuel” as that term is understood by those of ordinary skill in the art. Indeed this specialized type of fuel is described, for example, on page 5, line 21 – page 6, line 1; page 27 lines 2-4 – that is a fuel that is a gas at standard temperature and pressure.

Independent claim 17 was also rejected as being anticipated by the Scott reference. Among the features not disclosed by Scott with respect to this claim are the use of a manifold that is coupled to the combustion chamber, and providing a mixture of fuel and air to the combustion chambers through the manifold. Indeed, direct fuel injection is one common way a fuel charge is formed that does not pass through a manifold.

The Scott reference was also asserted to anticipate independent claim 28. Among the features of claim 28 not disclosed by the Scott reference are the specifically claimed use of a gaseous fuel and using a manifold to selectively supply the mixture of the gaseous fuel and air to each of a number of combustion chambers. The Scott reference also fails to disclose a means to provide a fuel and air mixture to a manifold.

Furthermore, independent claim 29 was rejected as being anticipated by the Scott reference. Among the features of claim 29 not disclosed by Scott are pressurizing the mixture of fuel and air with the compressor being driven by an exhaust turbine and retarding ignition. Furthermore, retarding ignition, as described in the detailed description for the present invention, involves the sending of signals to effectuate an ignition timing delay, which differs from the description in the Scott reference:

Operation of a shunt across switch 214 has the effect of attenuating (reducing the amplitude of) the voltage that is induced in the magneto secondary coil 212 by the magnetic interaction of secondary coil 212 with fly wheel 202 (FIG. 2), primary coil 210, and switch 214. The attenuated secondary voltage prevents optimal operation of spark plug 132 and therefore prevents engine 102 from operating at full efficiency. Complete combustion of the fuel does not occur. Incomplete combustion limits efficiency and power, and thus limits RPM.

Nonoptimal spark plug operation does not explicitly or implicitly mean an ignition timing delay. Accordingly, it is believed independent claims 1, 17, 28, and 29 are not anticipated by the Scott reference.

Besides the patentability of the respective base claims, further reasons support the patentability of dependent claims rejected as being anticipated by the Scott reference. For example, claim 6 defines an invention where ignition timing is changed to maintain the rotational speed in response to a sudden engine load loss of 30 percent or more. There is no teaching concerning controlling the engine speed of a gaseous fueled engine in Scott, let alone controlling the engine speed by changing ignition timing in response to a sudden engine load loss of 30 percent or more. In another example, claim 24 recites that the engine speed regulation be made in accordance with estimating the air mass flow based on an emptying/filling model of the manifold. For at least the reasons provided in connection with claim 17, the Scott reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the invention of claim 24. Therefore, further grounds support the patentability of rejected dependent claims.

Dependent claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Scott reference. Besides the patentability of base claim 17, the features of claim 19 are patentable for at least the reasons given in support of claim 29.

Dependent claim 16 was indicated to contain allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Subject matter contained in claim 16 has been combined with subject matter of the corresponding base claim 11 in a manner believed to be allowable, and claim 16 has correspondingly been cancelled. Rejected dependent claims 12-15 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as for base claim 11.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that claims 1-15 and 17-32 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested. Timely action towards a notice of allowability is hereby solicited. The Examiner is encouraged

to contact the undersigned by telephone to address any outstanding matters concerning the present application.

Respectfully submitted:



L. Scott Paynter  
Reg. No. 39,797  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty  
McNett & Henry  
Bank One Center Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137  
(317) 634-3456